

REMARKS

Applicants' representative thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended with regard to the information conveyed to the Examiner *via* phone on April 11, 2008, by Francis Dunn, relating to overcoming the rejection of the subject claims, wherein Applicants' representative contended that the cited art, including, for instance, Roberts *et al.*, "Visual Bracketing for Web Search Result Visualization", and Pook *et al.*, "Context Interaction in Zoomable User Interfaces", do not teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed subject matter.

Claims 1-27 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 11, 14, 24, and 26 have been amended as shown on pages 2-7 of the Reply. No new matter has been added, and amendments to the claims herein with not require a new search.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-12, 15-17, and 19-27 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-12, 15-17, and 19-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the article Roberts *et al.*, "Visual Bracketing for Web Search Result Visualization" (hereafter "Roberts *et al.*") in view of Pook *et al.*, "Context Interaction in Zoomable User Interfaces" (hereafter "Pook *et al.*"). It is requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reason. Roberts *et al.* and Pook *et al.*, either alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest each and every element of the subject claims. To reject a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a),

the prior art reference (or references when combined) ***must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.*** See MPEP § 706.02(j) (emphasis added). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. See *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

The claimed subject matter relates to automatic and dynamic presentation of search result information in accordance with an adjustable viewing lens that can balance the desire to examine a plurality of search results while promoting, expanding, or highlighting information of interest

within the lens. The claimed subject matter selectively animate, magnify, and/or present information associated with a search result(s) within a lens area as compared to the display of information outside the lens area. Further, additional information (e.g., query-relevant textual information associated with a search result) can be progressively inserted while the search result is within the lens area so that more information associated with the search result is displayed, as compared to the amount of information displayed when the search result is outside the lens area.

Employing animation of text and/or content insertion associated with a search result displayed within the lens area, the claimed subject matter can allow a user to more easily review more detailed information associated with the search result when displayed within the lens area, while providing a de-emphasized view of other information outside of the lens area. The de-emphasis of search results outside the lens area can allow more search results to be displayed in the interface in order to minimize the need for scrolling and other actions when multiple search results are obtained from a query, for example.

In particular, independent claim 1, as amended, recites: a layout component that *displays a detailed subset of information, comprising textual information, within the area defined by the lens component based upon the search result, the detailed subset of information is animated to enlarge in size and to include additional textual information that is selected from the at least one search result for insertion into the detailed subset of information based in part on a query associated with the at least one search result*, as compared to the amount of information displayed for the at least one search result when outside of the area defined by the lens component. Roberts *et al.* and Pook *et al.*, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest this distinctive aspect of the claimed subject matter.

Rather, Roberts *et al.* relates to a visual bracketing method that provides detail-in-context views where the inner part contains the Focus bracketed by the context information at a lower semantic level. (See Abstract.) Roberts *et al.* teaches a visual bracketing effect by displaying different semantic information in fore and after visualizations. (See § 2.2.) Roberts *et al.* further teaches an inner part that contains the detail view while the bracketed visualizations contain the context information at a lower level of detail. (See *id.*) However, unlike the claimed subject matter, Roberts *et al.* fails to teach displaying a detailed subset of information, including textual information, in the lens component based upon the search result, where the detailed subset of information is animated to enlarge in size and to include additional textual information

that is selected from the at least one search result for insertion into the detailed subset of information based in part on a query associated with the at least one search result.

Further, Pook *et al.* fails to cure the deficiencies of Roberts *et al.* with regard to the claimed subject matter. Pook *et al.* relates to zoomable user interfaces. (See p. 143, § 5.) Pook *et al.* teaches that users change the scale of their view of the information space depending on the level of detail that they want to see at a given moment. (See p. 115, § 4.4.) Pook *et al.* also teaches semantic zooming where, as a user zooms on an object, the object grows until it vanishes and is replaced by other objects that represent the same underlying information but in more detail. (See *id.*) However, unlike the claimed subject matter, Pook *et al.* fails to teach animating a subset of information to enlarge in size and to include additional textual information that is selected from a search result for insertion into the subset of information based in part on a query associated with the at least one search result. Instead, Pook *et al.* teaches that static portals can be used in semantic zooming. (See pp. 115-116, § 4.4.1.)

In contrast, the claimed subject matter can include a defined area (e.g., lens area) in an interface wherein a detailed subset of information, such as information related to a search result(s), can be displayed. In one aspect, when a search result is placed and/or displayed within the lens area, *additional textual information* or other information associated with that search result can be *inserted into the detailed subset of information* displayed within the lens area, as compared to the amount of information that is displayed when the search result is outside the lens area. The *additional textual information* can be *selected from the search result for insertion into the detailed subset of information based in part on the query* associated with the search result. In another aspect, a subset of information displayed within the lens area can be animated to enlarge in size (e.g., magnify in size) as compared to information displayed outside of the lens area in the interface.

As an example of content insertion, a search result (and other search results) can be returned and a subset of information related to the search result, such as a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) and/or a summary of the page associated with the search result and/or other information related to the search result, can be displayed in an interface, where the subset of information can be displayed outside the lens area. In accordance with an aspect, based in part on the query that produced the search result(s), the claimed subject matter can facilitate capturing additional information, such as query-relevant textual information, from the search result, and

the additional information can be available to be inserted into a detailed subset of information that can be displayed when the search result is within the lens area, as desired. When the lens area is placed over the search area, or when the search result is otherwise within the lens area, the additional information (e.g., query-relevant textual information) can be retrieved and inserted into the detailed subset of information displayed within the lens area to facilitate providing more detailed information regarding the search result.

Independent claim 21 (and similarly independent claim 20) recites: *inserting additional content associated with the at least one of the search results within the lens region, the additional content is selected from the at least one of the search results for insertion within the lens region based in part on a query associated with the at least one of the search results.*

Roberts *et al.* and Pook *et al.*, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest this distinctive aspect of the claimed subject matter.

For at least reasons similar to the reasons stated herein with regard to independent claim 1, Roberts *et al.* and Pook *et al.*, either alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest the distinctive aspects of the claimed subject matter. For instance, Roberts *et al.* and Pook *et al.* fail to teach selecting additional content associated with a search result for insertion within a lens region of an interface based in part on the query associated with the search result, when the search result is displayed within the lens region.

Independent claim 25 recites: a lens component to present at least one of the one or more display objects in a different format with respect to a collection of the one or more data items, the different format comprises *animation of the at least one of the one or more display objects to magnify that display object in size and modify that display object to include additional text that is retrieved from a result to be included in the display object based in part on a query associated with the result*, as compared to display objects outside of the lens component. For at least reasons similar to the reasons stated herein with regard to independent claim 1, Roberts *et al.* and Pook *et al.*, either alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest this distinctive feature of the claimed subject matter.

In view of at least the foregoing, it is readily apparent that Roberts *et al.* and Pook *et al.*, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed subject matter as recited in independent claim 1, 20, 21, and 25 (and associated dependent claims 2-6, 10, 12, 15-19, 22-24, 26, and 27). Accordingly, the subject claims are in condition for

allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claim 13 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts *et al.* in view of Pook *et al.* and further in view of Wolton *et al.* (US Pub. No. 2004/0030741) (hereafter “Wolton *et al.*”). It is requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reason. Roberts *et al.*, Pook *et al.*, and Wolton *et al.*, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every element of the claimed subject matter. Claim 13 depends from independent claim 1. Wolton *et al.* fails to cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Roberts *et al.* and Pook *et al.* with respect to independent claim 1. Rather, Wolton *et al.* relates to a tool for creating intelligent information management applications in the form of specialized search and retrieval agents. (See p. 3, ¶ [0048].) Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

III. Rejection of Claim 14 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts *et al.* in view of Pook *et al.* and further in view of Montague (US Pub. No. 2005/0168488) (hereafter “Montague”). It is requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reason. Roberts *et al.*, Pook *et al.*, and Montague, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every element of the claimed subject matter. Claim 14 depends from independent claim 1. Montague fails to cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Roberts *et al.* and Pook *et al.* with respect to independent claim 1. Rather, Montague relates to methods of combining user interfaces, such as zooming in/out, panning, rotating, drawing, selecting, and manipulating during a drag by a mouse for a graphics display. (See p. 1, ¶ [0004].) In view of at least the foregoing alone, the rejection should be withdrawn.

IV. Rejection of Claim 18 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts *et al.* in view of Pook *et al.* and further in view of Szabo (US Pub. No. 2007/0156677) (hereafter “Szabo”). It is requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reason.

Roberts *et al.*, Pook *et al.*, and Szabo, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every element of the claimed subject matter.

Claim 18 depends from independent claim 1. Szabo fails to cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Roberts *et al.* and Pook *et al.* with respect to independent claim 1. For at least the foregoing reason, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Further, Claim 18 additionally recites: *the dynamic information view is coordinated with an amount of information to progressively insert additional information associated with the at least one search result into the detailed subset of information according to an amount of time a mouse hovers over the at least one search result.* Roberts *et al.*, Pook *et al.*, and Szabo, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest this distinctive functionality of the claimed subject matter.

The Examiner states that Roberts *et al.* and Pook *et al.* fail to teach the claimed subject matter as recited in claim 18. (See Office Action dated February 15, 2008, p. 14, ¶ 9.) Further, Szabo fails to teach the distinctive functionality as recited in claim 18. Rather, Szabo relates to a user interface wherein the user may “hover”, or hold a graphic cursor near a screen object, to trigger a change in display rather than requiring a mouse click. (See p. 41, ¶ [0349].) However, Szabo fails to teach progressively inserting additional information associated with a search result into the detailed subset of information according to an amount of time a mouse hovers over the search result. Instead, Szabo teaches that while hovering, the user can increase the detail to see siblings, parents, and dependents related to taxonomic categories. (See p. 41, ¶ [00345]-[0350].) Szabo does not teach progressively inserting additional information related to a search result nor does Szabo teach progressive insertion of additional information based on the amount of time the mouse hovers over a search result.

In view of at least the foregoing, it is readily apparent that Roberts *et al.*, Pook *et al.*, and Szabo, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed subject matter as recited in claim 18. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP607US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TURNEY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TURNEY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731